

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

**USDC-SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC#:
DATE FILED: 10/25/2021**

PRIYA HARRIRAM,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOSEPH LUIS FERA AND LEHMAN
COLLEGE,

Defendants.

21-CV-3696 (RA)

ORDER

RONNIE ABRAMS, United States District Judge:

The Court is in receipt of Plaintiff's letter of October 18, 2021, renewing her application for the court to request pro bono counsel to represent her in this action. Dkt. 27.

As noted in the Court's previous order denying Plaintiff's first request for pro bono representation, Dkt. 22, there is no requirement in civil cases that courts appoint counsel to a litigant who cannot afford a lawyer. *See Hodge v. Police Officers*, 802 F.2d 58, 60 (2d Cir. 1986). In considering whether to grant an indigent litigant's request for pro bono counsel, a district court considers the merits of the case, the litigant's efforts to obtain a lawyer, and the litigant's ability to gather the facts and present the case if unassisted by counsel. *See Cooper v. A. Sargenti Co.*, 877 F.2d 170, 172 (2d Cir. 1989).


Although in her renewed request Plaintiff notes that she has contacted the New York Legal Assistance Group's pro se clinic, the Court is in no better position to assess the merits of her action. As explained in the application itself, requests for pro bono counsel are very rarely granted before the Court has issued a decision on the merits of the case.

Accordingly, Plaintiff's second request for pro bono counsel, Dkt. 27, is denied without prejudice. This means that Plaintiff may make the application again at a later point in the case.

The Clerk of Court is respectfully directed to terminate Dkt. 27 and to mail a copy of this order to Plaintiff.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 25, 2021
New York, New York

A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of a stylized 'R' followed by a long horizontal stroke that ends in a small hook.

Ronnie Abrams
United States District Judge